

DETAILED ACTION

This office action response responds to the Office Communication mailed on October 01, 2009. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-5, 19-23 are currently pending in the case. No new claims are added. Further examination and reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner states that Claims 1-5 & 19-23 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Britt; Margaret et al. [U.S. Patent 6,226,517 B1] and Slutsman; Lev et al. [US 6058313 A] and Mazzarella; Nick J. et al. [U.S. Patent 6,819,921 B2] further in view of Koster; Karl H. [U.S. Patent 6,240,293 B1].

The present invention, in one embodiment, teaches a central node that receives and executes queries for routing a call and minimizing the call setup delay. The central node of the present invention advantageously contains two tables that contain information for routing the call. Moreover, the central node communicates *with the different communication networks using a various protocols*. Therefore, in the present invention a single central node communicates with a variety of network elements. For example, the single central node communicates both with network elements both in TDMA network and GSM network. Further, the central node uses appropriate protocol for this communication. Support for this can be found atleast in Para. [0059], [0060] and [0065] of the published application.

The Examiner contents that Britt teaches triggering of a first query to the central node by a switching unit. Applicant respectfully traverses this contention. Firstly, Britt does not teach a single central node that communicates with different networks using appropriate protocol for communication. Moreover, Britt teaches sending a message by the switching center (O-MSC) to NPDB for Location Routing Number (LRN) (Col. 3, lines 6-19), which is unlike the present

invention. Merely sending a query for information by the O-MSC of Britt, which is different from the central node and information of the present invention, does not create obviousness. Moreover, Britt does not teach a plurality of tables on the central node containing the information for routing the call. Furthermore, Britt teaches sending a message from the O-MSC to HLR (Col. 4, lines 25-43), unlike the present invention, where a second query is sent from the central node to the HLR.

However, purely in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the instant application, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 19 to disclose that the central node communicates *with the different communication networks using a various protocols*. Britt does not discuss any central node, tables contained in the central node, or sending or receiving a query by the central node. Therefore, based on the above arguments and amendment made in Claims 1 and 19, the teachings of the present claim are not obvious in view of Britt.

The Examiner contends that Slutsman teaches triggering a third query from the central node to the number portability database. This contention is respectfully traversed. Slutsman teaches sending a query from a switching center to number portability database, unlike the present invention where the query is sent by the central node. As discussed above *the central node is different from a switching device and receives the query from a switching device*. Moreover, the query from the central node to the number portability database is triggered when the information is not available from the first and second queries. However, Slutsman does not discuss sending a query under any such condition. Furthermore, Slutsman does not teach a number portability database containing information on wireless networks or networks with different technologies. Therefore, based on the above discussion, the teachings of the present invention are not obvious in view of Slutsman. In particular, it is submitted that citation to Slutsman does not remedy the conceded deficiency in the citation to Britt. Accordingly, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, the asserted combination of Britt and Slutsman is likewise deficient, even in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner contends that Mazarella teaches a number portability database containing information on each of the wireless network having different technologies needed for call set-up procedure. Applicant respectfully traverses this contention. *Mazarella teaches different number portability databases for both old and new service providers* (Col. 4, lines 16-19). An innovative step is required to maintain a single database with information on different wireless technologies and for various networks. Therefore, the teachings of the present invention are not obvious in view of Mazzarella.

The Examiner contends that Koster remedies the deficiency of the asserted combination of citations. This contention is respectfully traversed. Firstly, Koster does not discuss the central node of the present invention. Further, the query is sent to an HLR in Koster, unlike to the second table of the present invention. The second table of the present invention contains information about HLR. Koster does not teach any second table. Therefore, Koster does not remedy the deficiency of the above citations.

The teachings of Britt, Slutsman, Mazzarella, or Koster taken independently or together do not teach a motivation to create the present invention. Britt, Slutsman, Mazzarella or Koster clearly teach away from the present invention and do not make it obvious. In particular, it is submitted that citation to Koster does not remedy the conceded deficiency in the Britt, Slutsman and Mazzarella. Accordingly, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, the asserted combination of Britt, Slutsman, Mazarella, and Koster is likewise deficient, even in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

When determining whether a claim is obvious, an examiner must make "a searching comparison of the claimed invention – including all its limitations – with the teaching of the prior art." In re Ochiai, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis added). Thus, "obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim." CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp., 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citing In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)).

Claims 2-5, and 20-23 are dependent on independent claims 1 and 19 respectively and incorporate all their limitations. For the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests they and all claims depending therefrom be passed to allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time.

Dated: January 4, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Raffi Gostanian/

Raffi Gostanian

Reg. No. 42,595

972.849.1310